From: Douglas Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/24/02 6:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Renata B. Hesse Antitrust Division U.S. Department of Justice 601 D Street NW Suite 1200 Washington, DC 20530-0001

Hello,

My name is Douglas Smith. I am a software developer for TeraTech, a company in Rockvile, Maryland. I firmly believe that the Proposed Final Judgement (PFJ) against Microsoft is weak and not in the public's interest. This is especially true in the section of the PFJ that has to do with defining the Windows Operating System. Any current and future operating systems designed by Microsoft that use any part of the Win32 API should be covered, since that is the core of the operating system, and the core of what defines the term "Windows compatible software."

Definition U: "Windows Operating System Product"

Microsoft's monopoly is on Intel-compatible operating systems. Yet the PFJ in definition U defines a "Windows Operating System Product" to mean only Windows 2000 Professional, Windows XP Home, Windows XP Professional, and their successors. This purposely excludes the Intel-compatible operating systems Windows XP Tablet PC Edition and Windows CE; many applications written to the Win32 APIs can run unchanged on Windows 2000, Windows XP Tablet PC Edition, and Windows CE, and with minor recompilation, can also be run on Pocket PC.

Microsoft even proclaims at www.microsoft.com/windowsxp/tabletpc/tabletpcqanda.asp:

"The Tablet PC is the next-generation mobile business PC, and it will be available from leading computer makers in the second half of 2002. The Tablet PC runs the Microsoft Windows XP Tablet PC Edition and features the capabilities of current business laptops, including attached or detachable keyboards and the ability to run Windows-based applications."

and Pocket PC: Powered by Windows

Microsoft is clearly pushing Windows XP Tablet PC Edition and Pocket PC in places (e.g. portable computers used by businessmen) currently served by Windows XP Home Edition, and thus appears to be trying to evade the Final Judgment's provisions. This is but one example of how Microsoft can evade

the provisions of the Final Judgment by shifting its efforts away from the Operating Systems listed in Definition U and towards Windows XP Tablet Edition, Windows CE, Pocket PC, X-Box, or some other Microsoft Operating System that can run Windows applications.

## Definition U currently reads:

U. "Windows Operating System Product" means the software code (as opposed to source code) distributed commercially by Microsoft for use with Personal Computers as Windows 2000 Professional, Windows XP Home, Windows XP Professional, and successors to the foregoing, including the Personal Computer versions of the products currently code named "Longhorn" and "Blackcomb" and their successors, including upgrades, bug fixes, service packs, etc. The software code that comprises a Windows Operating System Product shall be determined by Microsoft in its sole discretion.

## Definition U should be amended to read

U. "Windows Operating System Product" means any software or firmware code distributed commercially by Microsoft that is capable of executing any subset of the Win32 APIs, including without exclusion Windows 2000 Professional, Windows XP Home, Windows XP Professional, Windows XP Tablet PC Edition, Windows CE, PocketPC 2002, and successors to the foregoing, including the products currently code named "Longhorn" and "Blackcomb" and their successors, including upgrades, bug fixes, service packs, etc.

\_\_\_\_\_

Douglas M. Smith - Application Architect TeraTech - Tools for Programmers(tm) douglas@teratech.com

\_\_\_\_\_